

## DRAWING AMENDMENTS

Two replacement figures are proposed in the instant Office Action response. First, a new Fig. 20 is proposed. During a telephone interview with Examiner Green, the applicants determined that the valley trusses in the original Fig. 20 were inconsistently identified and also realized that the positioning of multiple present invention devices in Fig. 20 made them difficult to view. As a result, one of the applicants has redrawn Fig. 20 with a clarified identification of the valley trusses therein and the needed positioning of the present invention device relative to each valley truss. The applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the changes made to Fig. 20. Further, since the new Fig. 20 more accurately identifies the usable position of the present invention relative to each valley truss used, the applicants believe that the original Fig. 21 no longer adds any new information about valley trusses or the present invention. Thus, since the old Fig. 21 has become merely duplicative, the applicants propose that the original Fig. 21 be deleted. In addition, the applicants provide herein a new illustration intended to replace the Fig. 22 they proposed in their June 20, 2003 response to an Election/Restriction requirement. Further, since the original Fig. 21 has been canceled, the replacement illustration for the previously proposed Fig. 22 has been given the marking of Fig. 21 ('new' Fig. 21 for purposes of discussion herein). The replacement illustration marked as 'new' Fig. 21 is different from the Fig. 22 it replaces in that its bottom surface is now shown as being planar (not arcuate) so that it more closely resembles the embodiments of the present invention shown in original Figs. 1, 15, and 17-19. The 'new' Fig. 21 also shows web member 10 and base member 6 having a greater thickness than is shown in Figs. 15 and 19, however, the thickness of web member 10 and base member 6 was not identified in the original disclosure as being a critical dimension. Although 'new' Fig. 21 represents a molded embodiment of the present invention in which its wedge 8 shares a common surface with the lower end of web member 10, thus making a closed wedge with three perimeter sides when viewed in cross-section that does not rely on any portion of the construction material to which it will become attached to for its third perimeter side, the

applicants believe that no new matter has been added thereby since page 17, lines 6-10 of the original disclosure discuss a molded embodiment. The applicants argue that the Examiner should allow this 'new' Fig. 21 to be a part of their allowed disclosure, as it is the finished shape of their valley truss strap and the manner in which it is used that are novel, irrespective of the method used to create that shape. Further, 'new' Fig. 21 is consistent with the elected Group 4 wherein the base member does not extend beyond the tapered end of the wedge. Other U.S. Patents, such as U.S. Patent 4,455,791 to Elko (1984), which in the discussion of its Fig. 4 discloses that its gutter's cover can be preformed out of plastic or metal, as well as U.S. Patent 6,516,498 to La Coy (2003) for a clamp that discloses manufacture out of plastic or metal, support the applicant's argument that different materials, to include plastics and flat steel, can be contemplated as alternative options for the construction of the embodiments in a single patentable invention. Therefore, the applicants respectfully argue that the Examiner herein should follow precedent and allow proposed 'new' Fig. 21 to become a part of the instant patent application disclosure. Thus, the applicants request reconsideration and clarification by the Examiner on this issue.





Fig 21





Fig 20